

**Advisory Committee Meeting  
Great Hall, Wellesley Town Hall  
Thursday, April 11, 2019, 7:00 p.m.**

Those present from the Advisory Committee included Jane Andrews, Todd Cook, Rose Mary Donahue, Bill Maynard, Paul Merry, Dave Murphy, Lina Musayev, Betsy Roberti, Mary Scanlon, Tom Skelly and Andrea Ward.

Tom Skelly called the public hearing to order at 7:00 p.m.

**7:00 p.m. Public Hearing on Warrant Articles for the May 13, 2019 Special Town Meeting (STM)**

Tom Skelly opened the hearing with an introduction:

- There will be a general Citizen Speak opportunity on non-STM matters after this public hearing
- Hearing is an opportunity for the public to share views on STM warrant articles
- Brief explanation of Advisory Committee, its function, and how it fits within overall Town process
  - 15 residents appointed by Town Moderator for 3-year terms
  - Serve as advisors to Town Meeting
  - Similar to Finance Committees in other towns, but broader charter (zoning, bylaws, etc.)
  - Advisory performs due diligence by asking questions (and seeking supporting documentation) that a Town Meeting Member (TMM) might ask
  - Advisory does not set priorities for the Town, does not create articles or bylaws; Advisory's influence is based on the rigor and strength of its analysis
  - Advisory Report summarizing Advisory's considerations is mailed to all TMMs and is available to all residents online, as well as at the Town Clerk's office and the Library
- Public hearing process tonight
  - Will summarize each article on the STM warrant in order
  - Anyone who wants to speak to an article, please approach and sign in
  - Advisory's role is to listen and take input; there will be no formal response, dialogue or debate; however, clarification may be requested
- Public hearing is not the only opportunity to share comments; Advisory meets weekly and has citizen speak at every meeting; meeting agendas and minutes are posted on the Town website; videos of the meetings are available on Wellesley Media; comments can be emailed to the Advisory Committee

Mr. Skelly read a summary of each article on the warrant, in numerical order, and offered the public an opportunity to comment on each one. Comments were made concerning the following articles:

Article 2 (Smart Growth Zoning (40R), Wellesley Office Park)

*Marla Robinson, 33 Windsor Road*

- Involved in the commercial real estate business
- Wellesley Office Park (WOP) project has the potential to be a large development with a lot of positive things for the Town
- Concerned about the development agreements (DAs) that go along with the zoning changes
- There is a long tradition of Town Meeting having some control/approval over the DAs (e.g., Linden Street project and Harvard Pilgrim project)
- Changing the zoning will have long-term ramifications for the Town

- Important for Town Meeting to have an understanding of the DA and in the long-term some control over it

Article 3 (Smart Growth Zoning (40R) Map Amendments)

*Ann-Mara Lanza, 18 Oakland Street*

- Speaking as an affordable housing advocate
- Wellesley really needs more housing, more housing diversity and more affordability
- Crucial to make WOP happen, as it will produce 88 affordable units in the first phase (350 units)

Article 9 (Funding for Mental Health and Social Services)

*Ann-Mara Lanza, 18 Oakland Street*

- Speaking as Library Trustee to offer Library's perspective
- Shared comments from Library Director, Jamie Jurgenson, in support of Article 9 additional mental health resources
- Since the Library is open and free to the public, staff encounters Library patrons with homelessness and mental health issues
- Board of Health (BOH) social worker, Council on Aging (COA) social worker and Police have been very helpful; there is cooperation/collaboration between the departments in handling specific cases
- BOH also sponsors mental health seminars for Library staff

*Karen Wolfson, 31 Pine Plain Road*

- Member, Temple Beth Elohim Mental Health Initiative
- Article 9/proposed increase in mental health funding is based on a comprehensive study of Town resources and is supported by Board of Selectmen (BOS)
- Increase in number of cases of people needing support and in the complexity of those cases
- Increasing number of mental health calls to police; School resources not available on weekends/breaks; and Human Resources Services, Inc. (HRS) can't provide enough services
- Town report concluded that the departments work together but there isn't enough support
- National statistics show that high number of adults and children affected by mental health don't receive services; statistics show increasing suicide rates across all ages and genders
- Through personal experiences, knows that Wellesley reflects these statistics; people are silent about mental health struggles
- Proud to live in a town that recognizes this is an issue and is willing to review resources and needs
- Mental health struggles are everywhere; think about how this funding will directly affect and save lives

*Joelle Reidy, 60 Prospect Street*

- Read letter into record on behalf of a constituent (Michele Crisman, 86 Benvenue Street) in support of increased funding for mental health
- Professional experiences have demonstrated importance of linking behavioral health care with primary care; her practice uses licensed social workers to immediately link at-risk patients with mental health clinicians
- Increasing social worker capabilities as well as increasing availability of support from professionals such as HRS is critical

Tom Skelly concluded the public hearing at 7:25 p.m. and opened the regular meeting of the Advisory Committee.

## **7:25 p.m. Citizen Speak**

There was no one present for Citizen Speak.

## **7:25 p.m. Discussion of STM Warrant Articles**

### Article 9 (Funding for Mental Health and Social Services)

Advisory comments on this article included:

- Never has been a question that the needs for mental health services are high and increasing. Pleased that the BOS took on the study. Advisory had recommended last year that there be a review of the various services provided; the report is a great help. Question has always been, what is the best way to organize the services; when Advisory first heard this proposal in early March, it wasn't exactly clear how it would work. Advisory appreciates the additional work that BOS and BOH and other departments have done to think about and better articulate the structure. Satisfied with the boards' commitment to do a follow-up report in one year. Given the uncertainty of when the position will be filled, recommend that a six-month report be done to let people know how things are operating; will help document additional needs.
- No doubt there is a need for additional mental health services, but since we don't have funding for extensive additional support, interested as to where the line will be drawn—how much additional support can be provided. Also, very interested in how to account for time; what are the metrics/measurements for service delivery.
- BOH purpose is to support the needs of the community; over the past few years, the needs have increased but the funding has not. BOH is trying to do so much, but hasn't had the time to step back and create a strategic report. Agree with suggestion about producing a six-month report.
- This proposal will help the BOH identify what the needs are; the presentation on Monday by the BOS/BOH cleared up many questions; a plan has been developed to quantify where the resources can be best applied. Encouraged by boards' commitment to do follow-up reporting.
- Initially was skeptical of this proposal because, whenever there is a proposal to add FTEs, it's up to Advisory to question that. Requests that come through Advisory earlier in the year as part of strategic plans are easier to evaluate; this request came in somewhat last minute and felt as though it was not as developed as it could be. Since that time, good work has been done. Dialogue with BOS about how the licensed clinical social worker (LICSW) is used will be important. Allocating services to the economically fragile, for whom there are not as many services, should be a priority.
- A comment was made that the LICSW position is listed as 80% "doing" and 20% planning; that may be inaccurate based on everyone's expectations; new hire should understand expectations.

## **7:34 p.m. Voting on STM Warrant Articles**

*Andrea Ward made and Rose Mary Donahue seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 9, as proposed by the Board of Health and the Board of Selectmen, that the Town vote to transfer \$175,000 from Free Cash to fund additional mental health and social services for Fiscal Year 2020. The motion passed unanimously (10-0).*

*Andrea Ward made and Rose Mary Donahue seconded a motion for favorable action on Warrant Article 10, as proposed by the Board of Selectmen, that the Town vote to amend Section 8.10 of the General Bylaws, Notice of Town Meeting, by eliminating the words "Wellesley Square" and replacing them with "the Police Station." The motion passed unanimously (10-0).*

## 7:37 p.m. Continued Discussion on STM Warrant Articles

### Articles 2 & 3 (Zoning Bylaw and Map amendments re: Wellesley Office Park project)

Meghan Jop, Executive Director, was present to answer questions.

Ms. Jop provided a brief update on developments since last week's Advisory meeting:

- Town received Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD) comments/initial approval on proposed zoning language
- BOS has approved and executed development agreement (DA)

A request was made for a response to the comment made during the public hearing that, unlike this project, Town Meeting has had input into DAs for previous Town projects: WOP is unlike past projects (i.e., Linden Square). For Linden Square, it was the DA that limited square footage of the project and created provisions for modifications to come back through Town Meeting; for WOP, it's really the zoning language (i.e., the specific Wellesley Park Smart Growth Zoning District), rather than the DA, that limits uses (e.g., limiting small-scale retail establishments to 19,500 gross square feet for entire district, limiting office and office/high tech amounts). DA for this project really speaks to the affordable housing component and the impacts of development (e.g., how the Town and developer would split the cost of infrastructure; traffic review). Any modifications in zoning and uses in the future will require Town Meeting approval; moreover, they would require a two-thirds vote instead of a simple majority.

A follow-up question was asked confirming that the DA in this case is really the up-front set up and the infrastructure, but the zoning provisions control matters going forward: Zoning cannot dictate ownership; DA is necessary to ensure these properties are rental.

There was a question as to whether the DAs will be included in the Advisory Report: Given the complexity, working on a web page with links to all the documents.

A question was asked as to how amendments to the DA will be handled: Through the BOS public meeting process.

There was a request to identify/review the specific changes that DHCD had suggested to the zoning provisions: The changes are identified in blue; not substantive; includes things like definitions, etc.; a lot of provisions for DHCD approval. There was a follow-up question regarding changes suggested by DHCD to the DA: Under Section 1.4, local preference, they wanted Town to specify not just residents of the Town but also employees of the Town and of businesses located in Town and families with children attending the Town's Schools (allows METCO student families to be eligible); these are preferences that Town already used for Belclare project.

The net anticipated change in tax revenue for Phase I was discussed: Current taxes for 40 William Street are \$287,000; no loss in tax revenue for property anticipated.

There was a question seeking confirmation that, going forward re: WOP, any changes to the zoning would require two-thirds Town Meeting approval, as well as DHCD approval.

There was a brief discussion about scheduling/voting. The Planning Board (PB) held its public hearing last night but did not vote on the articles due to a noticing issue regarding the meeting. PB will be meeting on May 6 to vote. Accordingly, Advisory will not be voting the articles tonight; will wait until PB has voted. At the PB public hearing, no one spoke regarding WOP. There was general consensus of support by PB members for all three projects.

A comment was made in general support of the project but seeking information on the environmental strategy section (Exhibit F to the DA). A question was asked what input the Town will have in an ongoing way on the environmental strategy and future opportunities for sustainability: There will be input via the site plan review process. All non-housing elements of the project will go through normal Project of Significant Impact (PSI) site plan review process. All modifications on commercial sites require public hearing process. Residential units go through a more streamlined review under 40R but includes wetlands review and public hearing. There will be opportunities to comment in detail on future development on the WOP site. If in the future owner wanted to do additional landscaping or needed stormwater management, would be either major or minor project and would go through site plan process; all modifications unless really small scale will require hearing.

A comment was made that this project is a big commitment because it's not only committing to the first phase, it's committing to the second phase, which adds a lot of density to the site. It should be noted in the Advisory Report that great care will need to be paid through other permitting processes to issues like traffic, which is very significant and ever-changing. However, this process has been very thorough and nothing has jumped out in terms of omissions/concerns.

A question was asked if there are any other places in Town that will be able to use the 40R zoning: Perhaps the Tailby lot; terrific 40R location because of proximity to transportation. Once the 40R enabling language is in place in Zoning Bylaw, Town can craft provisions/specific language for other developments.

There was a question as to whether the BOS has voted yet: The BOS voted unanimously (5-0) to execute the DA and the attachments to it (including zoning language). No changes are expected to the DA; zoning language is 95-98% final.

Articles 4, 5, 6 & 7 (Zoning Bylaw and Map amendments re: Delanson Circle & 10, 148 Weston Road projects)

- There are no substantive changes in the Residential Overlay District (RIO) language (Article 4) since the last Advisory meeting
- Minimum lot size is anticipated to stay at 45,000 square feet
  - Had been discussing taking a small amount of land and giving it to neighboring parcel but that would in turn reduce the number of units developer could build

There was a question whether Article 5 (Yard Regulations amendments) is just giving relief from setbacks in the RIO district: In our existing commercial districts, there are no requirements.

Regarding Articles 6 and 7, there was a question whether, if the RIO overlay is operative, what the point is of changing the underlying zoning from single residence to general residence: For Delanson, it's primarily map clean-up and eliminating some split-zoning. For Weston Road, it allows the property at 140 Weston Road to be divided into two pieces; changing the zoning to general residence will facilitate the later development of the portion of the property that currently contains the house (and the life estate) into a two-family unit

A question was asked about where negotiations stand with 144 Weston Road: Developer continuing efforts to find a resolution to any issues.

There was a request to hear from the neighborhood regarding these projects.

Anne Marie Towle, 7 Oakencroft Road, spoke:

- Direct abutter to the Delanson project

- Member of the College Heights Association Steering Committee, which was formed almost two years ago (115 families on mailing list)
- She and neighbors were unanimously opposed to original 95-unit 40B proposal; concerns regarding traffic, pedestrians, overall size
- Has attended every Zoning Board of Appeals (ZBA) hearing on 40B, BOS meetings, Planning Board meetings, trying to come to reasonable solution that neighborhood more comfortable with
- Neighborhood is very much in favor of this proposal for Delanson
- There will be benefits to Hollis Street, too, which is a non-conforming private way
- Neighborhood equally supportive of Weston Road project

A question was asked as to what comments the Planning Board received at its public hearing on the Delanson/Weston Road projects (Articles 4-7):

- TMM/resident of Westerly Road had concerns about density and impact of access to Hollis Street – developer went through modifications, including paving of Hollis Street and relocation of access points and sidewalks
- Two neighbors spoke in support of project
- A few questions about permitting for this – particularly related to traffic (i.e., what happens if estimates/projections don't hold true); this will be addressed in PSI process, which requires follow-up studies and post-occupancy studies; if estimates come back 10% or more higher than projections, then additional mitigation can be sought from developer

There was a comment expressing support for the Delanson/Weston Road projects.

There was a question as to where things stand in terms of finalization of materials for these two projects: Finalizing the DAs; not a lot of changes on zoning; issue with 140 Weston Road DA.

Article 8 (Zoning Bylaw amendment re: list of zoning districts)

There was a question whether (1) the proposed new Section 1 language was missing the general Smart Growth Overlay District (14J) from the list, which is mentioned in the warrant, and (2) whether the terms of the warrant (which doesn't mention the Solar Overlay District) allow the Solar Overlay District to be added to the list: These will be looked into.

**8:31 p.m. Minutes Approval/Liaison Reports/Administrative Matters**

Andrea Ward made and Rose Mary Donahue seconded a motion to approve the minutes for March 2, April 1, April 2, and April 8, with noted changes. The motion passed unanimously.

SBC/Jane Andrews

- Superintendent presented the concept of internal swing space to the Hunnewell community
- Could work because of declining enrollment
- Each of the six Hunnewell grades would go to one of the other schools for two year period (21-22 and 22-23)
- Community thinking about implications; there were many good questions
- Efforts will be made to maintain the Hunnewell community culture; the principal (Ellen Quirk) would rotate among all the schools
- Students will stay with their own cohorts
- Other principals have been brought into the conversation
- Superintendent and the principal seem to favor this over 12 classrooms at Sprague
- Receiving schools feel it's easier than having modulars dropped onto playgrounds

- At least one parent said it would be too disruptive
- SBC public forum is delayed until May 9; there will be two more SBC meetings prior to that, which will allow for more deliberation
- The Superintendent didn't give specific numbers on costs – estimated \$1 million to offer free busing to all Hunnewell students, compared to roughly \$7 million for modulars at Sprague
- Cost of escalation (delaying Hunnewell construction) is \$9 million
- Details are still being worked out

### **8:38 p.m. Adjourn**

Rose Mary Donahue made and Lina Musayev seconded a motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

### **Items reviewed during the meeting**

- *Proposed Zoning Bylaw Sections 14J (Smart Growth Overlay Districts) and 14J.1 (Wellesley Park Smart Growth Overlay District) (April 11, 2019 draft)*
- *Proposed Amendments to Zoning Bylaw Section 14F, Residential Incentive Overlay*
- *Proposed Amendments to Zoning Bylaw Section 19, Yard Regulations*
- *Proposed Zoning Map Amendments for Articles 3, 6 and 7*
- *Proposed Amendments to Zoning Bylaw Section 1A (List of Districts)*
- *10.0 Wellesley Office Park Development Agreement*
- *10.3 Delanson Circle Development Agreement*
- *10.4 148 Weston Road Development Agreement*